

4-20-2007

Academic Policies Committee Annual Report for Academic Year 2006-2007 report to the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Annual Report for Academic Year 2006-2007 report to the Academic Senate" (2007). *All Committee Minutes*. 171.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/171

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlengen1@udayton.edu.

APC Annual Report for Academic Year 2006-2007
20 April 2007

The bulk of the APC's work this year revolved around the Provost's charge to review the *Habits of Inquiry* report. In the Fall, the committee resolved to handle the review in two phases. Phase one was to consist of a review of the learning outcomes in sections I-V of the document to determine if they captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions. Concluding that the report had met these criteria, the committee appointed a subcommittee of Darrow, Duncan, O'Gorman and Penno to determine whether or not the university community as a whole agreed. After conducting a series of open forums and individual presentations, the subcommittee presented its findings to the APC, which then reported them to the Senate on 30 November 2006 (Appendix A).

Anticipating approval during the Phase I review process, the APC began developing a series of guidelines for Phase II—the review of the recommendations section of the HIR document. For this purpose, the committee designed a system of working groups to review individual sections of the document recommendations with the goal of fulfilling its charge to “generate a set of recommendations regarding specific programs, infrastructure, faculty development, and resources necessary to realize the educational aims and learning outcomes.” The committee devised a draft charge to the working groups (for the latest version see Appendix B). Originally, the committee proposed the creation of five working groups that divided the task of review into the following categories:

- Working Group #1** First Year Seminar, Humanities Base, & General Education
- Working Group #2** Service & Experiential Learning, Multi/Interdisciplinary Programs
- Working Group #3** Intercultural and Global Learning
- Working Group #4** Student Scholarship and Culminating Experiences
- Working Group #5** Faculty Development, Communication, & Pedagogy

Each of the working groups was to be chaired by one or more members of the APC. Initial discussions in the winter term resulted in a decision to postpone the convocation of the fifth working group until the APC had processed interim reports from the other WGs. The original draft charge to the WGs contained certain recommendations connected to their membership. It was with these recommendations in mind that the APC began assembling lists of faculty and staff to be invited to serve as WG members in the Winter term. This proved to be a rather drawn out process, as the preliminary lists required amendment after the initial round of invitations failed to yield adequate representation from each of the divisions of the university. There was also some question as to the wording of the charges to the WGs. As such, the process has moved at a disappointingly slow pace. To date, only WG #1 has met. Discussions in the working group are headed in the direction of first, trying to determine what students should get out of a first year seminar. The following questions were raised: What is the purpose (or what ought to be the purpose) of the seminar? Are students' educational and developmental needs best addressed through a seminar, or would they be best served by a quilt or tapestry of experiences to accomplish these goals? The WG will pick up with these questions in the fall. Hopefully, each of the other WGs will be able to have at least an electronic organizational meeting (e.g., circulation and submission of F 07 availability) before May 15.

In addition to this work, the APC reviewed and commented on the draft of an ENG department proposal to revise the current writing course sequence to make it more consistent with student developmental needs. Rather than frontloading the writing into the first year, the proposal would spread the two required semesters over the first year and sophomore year. This would also address the well-documented issue of the dramatic dip in student writing that occurs on campus between the first year and junior/senior years.

The Committee also worked with the calendar committee on the next round of academic calendars. Discussions produced a consensus to work with the registrar over the long term to increase the length of the break between fall and winter term, when possible. The calendar discussion also raised the need to continue to examine the general exam period guidelines to ensure an adequate distribution of the study days throughout the exam period.

Much of the committee's work was hampered, in both semesters, by the difficulty of raising a quorum. We urge the Senate to consider policy changes that will ensure either the replacement of faculty on leave or who resign and that will provide a mechanism for conducting routine business when a quorum cannot be assembled because of conflicting schedules.

APPENDIX A

**Report of the Academic Policy Committee
Subcommittee on *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection*
November 30, 2006**

The APC charged the subcommittee with ascertaining whether or not the campus community believed that sections I-V of *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR)* captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions. To this end, the subcommittee, comprised of D. Darrow, C. Duncan, J. O’Gorman, R. Penno, created a program that would a) review the provenance and contents of sections I-V; b) present this review to a wide audience, and; c) collect feedback from the campus community. The subcommittee presented this program and plan of action at the Senate meeting of October 13. The subcommittee then presented this review at (in addition to the already-mentioned Senate meeting) two widely-advertised open forums on October 31, and November 15; a full faculty meeting of the School of Business Administration on October 20; a meeting of the Library faculty on November 16; and a meeting of the College of Arts and Sciences chairs and program directors (CCPD) on November 8. The topic was also discussed at the fall Humanities Base faculty meeting on November 1 (approximately 20-25 regular faculty were in attendance). The School of Engineering forwarded its comments from a full faculty discussion last year as its contribution to this process. The Dean of the School of Education and Allied Professions (SOEAP) encouraged the faculty to attend one of the forums. In addition, the SOEAP Dean had each department chair share the document with his or her department and be certain their members understood the document and its implications. SOEAP will also use *Habits* to review the conceptual framework of the unit in preparation for our accreditation visit.

The open forums were lightly attended. The subcommittee has no data to explain this and so must speculate that the lack of attendance was due either to apathy or the fact that the open forums were not the first opportunity that faculty have had to discuss the document. Each of the other presentations took place before a large audience. At the end of each of the open forums and the presentations to the other groups the audience was asked to indicate by a show of hands whether or not it believed that sections I-V of *HIR* captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions. The membership of the CCPD gave sections I-V near unanimous approval.^{1[1]} The SBA faculty also gave sections I-V near unanimous approval.^{2[2]} The Library faculty fully supported the document. The results of the Humanities Base presentation discussion were inconclusive.

Most significantly, in each case there were no participants who registered a “no” vote (i.e., did not agree that sections I-V captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions). Each of the events produced a rich conversation about the report and its place in the Catholic intellectual tradition. In general, there was much curiosity about *HIR* and its role as an extension of the UD mission statement, the *Vision of Excellence, Characteristics of Marianist Education*, and other key documents. The presentation prompted several inquiries into what was meant by Catholic social teaching. Indeed many of the questions seemed to be as connected to an exploration of what UD is all about as much as to the document itself. The fact that many faculty were eager to move on to a discussion of the recommendations also seemed to indicate that the document has already done much to stimulate thought about current and future curricula.

^{1[1]} The president of the Academic Senate believed that registering a vote at the CCPD meeting would be inappropriate given his Senate position and abstained.

^{2[2]} Two faculty members answered, “We don’t know,” which can be interpreted as abstention.

Concerns about the document expressed at the each of the meetings centered on three issues: scholarship, sacramentality and process.^{3[3]} The question on scholarship emerged in the discussions with the SBA, where several faculty members simply wanted to know more precisely what constituted scholarship as defined by the document. The resultant discussion seemed to satisfy their curiosity. Some Humanities Base faculty expressed concern that the document, in their reading, did not say more to promote academic rigor. One department suggested that, although the document was certainly a good Catholic and Marianist document, it was a substantial departure from the direction UD had been heading over the last decade.^{4[4]} There were also some concerns and confusion about the process by which the document came to and was being processed by the Senate. The most frequent and pointed concern, however, was over the term sacramentality. For some faculty the term was too Catholic. For others, the way the term is used in the document is not Catholic enough. Some faculty noted that the explanatory paragraph and subsequent discussion provided an adequate explanation of what was meant by “seeks knowledge in a sacramental spirit.” They also indicated that they understood and agreed with the intent of the term. They were concerned, however, that as the phrase would not always be accompanied by the explanatory paragraph that people would come to view “sacramental” in the same context as the Seven Sacraments. Some faculty also expressed the concern that using the term would make UD appear less inclusive to the outside world. At the same time, none of the participants in the discussion was able to provide an alternative term. The subcommittee recognizes these concerns and concludes that, given the fairly even split between those concerned that the use of the term was too Catholic and those who believed that the way the term is used is not Catholic enough, that perhaps the document did, in fact, use the term “just right.”

Recommendation: After the many campus conversations, the subcommittee concludes that the university community believes that *HIR* captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions. As such, the subcommittee recommends that the APC endorse sections I-V of the document as having captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions, communicate this to the Senate, and proceed with an examination and discussion of the recommendations in the concluding sections of the document.

Attached:

Sense of the Student Academic Policies Committee regarding DOC I-06-09

Minutes of the Department of Philosophy Meeting of Friday, October 20

Response from the Department of History

School of Engineering Response to the Marianist Education Working Group Document

^{3[3]} Three units, HST, PHL and SAPAS, submitted individual comments.

^{4[4]} See the attached response from the Department of History.

APPENDIX B

DRAFT #6
Charge to APCAS Working Groups (WG) on *HIR*

GUIDING PROFESSIONAL PRINCIPLES

- Curricular change is a faculty responsibility
- Neither the Provost nor the Deans have the level of responsibility for the curriculum as does the faculty.

- Neither ECAS nor APCAS has the responsibility for “doing the work” of curriculum design, revision, or development as does the faculty.
- Therefore, the goal of the *HIR* review process is to move the work to the faculty as soon as possible.

PLAN

By 11/30/06, answer the question of Phase 1 and determine plan for addressing Phase 2

PHASE 1 “Does the Senate believe that the MEWG captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions? If so, I respectfully request that

PHASE 2 “ the Senate take appropriate action on the document through its committee structure in order to generate a set of recommendations regarding specific programs, infrastructure, faculty development, and resources necessary to realize the educational aims and learning outcomes.”

Although the APCAS has designed a two-phase process regarding *HIR*, the goal is to engage in an integrative and holistic study. The Catholic and Marianist Tradition provide UD not only the ground for these recommendations, but also the generative culture for ongoing exploration. As the report states on p. 9:

As well as reflecting the discussions initiated by the Working Group, these recommendations draw upon other work on the curriculum being done by the First Year Team, the Humanities Base Committee, the Cluster Coordinating Committee, the Committee on General Education and Competencies, and faculty involved in various academic excellence initiatives funded by the provost. These recommendations are also designed to advance the seven strategic goals set out in A Vision of Excellence.

CHARGES COMMON TO ALL WGs

- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups.
- Determine a structure and set of procedures for the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Review the assigned curricular recommendations from *HIR*.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Consider means by which the implemented recommendations might be assessed.

MEMBERSHIP

- A member of APCAS will chair each WG. The core membership of each WG will be determined by the APCAS.
- Other Senators can volunteer for the WG or their choice.
- Other Senators can nominate non-Senate members (nominations to be sent to WG chair).
- Each WG should invite members from key stakeholder groups.

TIMELINE

- An Initial Report is due from each WG by May 15, 2007.
- An Interim Report is due from each WG by November 1, 2007.

- A Final WG report is due by February 2008.
- The *HIR* Steering Committee's Interim Report will include any changes in the charges for the WGs as well as more specific guidelines for the final report due in March 2008.

OVERSIGHT

The **HIR Strategic Task Force Steering Committee**, led by APC members with representatives from Student Development and Campus Ministry, will monitor the necessary steps to encourage holistic and integrated work across the Working Groups; it will also monitor the “infrastructure and implication” issues identified by the Working Groups. The Steering Committee will also function as the “writing committee” for the final version of *HIR*.

Working Group #1

First Year Seminar, Humanities Base, and General Education

Membership

David Darrow and Chris Duncan, Co-Chairs

R. Alakkad

R. Berney

M. Daniels

C. Daprano

M. Donahue

D. Doyle

K. Henderson

C. Merithew

D. Pair

C. Schramm

L. Scott

J Shishoff

C. Sullivan

K. Webb

S. Wilhoit

CM, Senators, students

Charge

- Determine an efficient structure for conducting the work of the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Develop a plan to reform and revitalize ASI 150 into a 3-hour first-year seminar (FYS) that fosters engaging academic inquiry and reflection and orients students to the nature and purposes of a University of Dayton education.
- Review the existing system of general education in light of the learning outcomes contained in parts I-V of the *HIR* report.
- Develop model to align Learning-living communities (LLC), with the Humanities Base Program (HBP), and general education over four years.

- Consider models to conceptually expand the HBP to include the new FYS and the incorporation of the lines of inquiry from Arts Study, Science, and Social Science.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timeline

- An Initial Report is due by **May 15, 2007**. The report should describe how the WG plans to conduct its work (e.g., division into subcommittees, consultation with existing university committees, etc.)
- An Interim Report is due by November 1, 2007. The report should contain preliminary recommendations related to an FYS, conclusions from the review of current system of general education and a plan for aligning the FYS, HBP and general education with LLCs.
- A Final Report is due February 2008.

Focus

In conducting its work, the WG should consider the following recommendations from the *HIR* report:

VI.A. Recommendations for the first year of study.

1. Revise **first-year seminars** substantially to become academically challenging courses that foster engaging academic inquiry and reflection and orient students to the nature and purposes of a University of Dayton education. First-year seminars should be designed to promote the core learning outcomes, especially in scholarship, diversity, community, and vocation. They should also be coordinated with the Humanities Base Program. Some seminars may be offered in conjunction with first-year learning-living communities. First-year seminars should require that students begin construction of academic portfolios and also offer opportunities for service-based learning, focused partly on the campus community. First-year seminars would also be powerful vehicles through which to promote student learning about health and personal discipline in the context of students' educational development. In order to achieve these aims, first-year seminars should be expanded in curricular significance, either by counting for 3-4 semester hours of General Education credit or through linking with General Education courses. Ideally, these should be small, interdisciplinary, writing-intensive courses. The University should explore the possibility that writing-intensive seminars might replace one of the English composition courses in the first year. Collaboration with the Libraries, Student Development, and Campus Ministry will be essential to future development of first-year seminars. [Learning outcomes 1, 3-4, 7]
2. Revise the **Humanities Base Program** to lay the foundation for all core learning outcomes for the common academic program and to facilitate coordination with the objectives of first-year seminars and first-year learning-living communities. In particular, all Humanities Base courses should contribute to students' examination of faith traditions and to their academic encounters with diversity. As expressed in the current Humanities

Base goals, all Humanities Base courses should actively support consideration of global perspectives. [All learning outcomes]

VI.B. Recommendations for the first and second years of study

1. Expand **Arts Study** offerings for first- and second-year students. Some of these courses should be coordinated with first-year seminars, Humanities Base courses, and first-year learning communities. Some Arts courses might be coordinated with proposals below for the second or third years of study. Study of, and active participation in, the arts provide uniquely powerful occasions to explore modes of inquiry, reflection, and experiential immersion in the world that advance the proposed student learning outcomes. [All learning outcomes]
2. Incorporate **scientific inquiry**, as pursued in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, and technology, more deliberately in the first and second years of study. Inquiry using the methods of these fields should be pursued in some first-year seminars. Some introductory science courses in General Education should be coordinated with courses in the Humanities Base or with first-year courses in the social sciences or arts. Courses that explore the distinctive methodologies and habits of mind in scientific fields advance learning outcomes for scholarship, community, practical wisdom, and critical evaluation of our times. Scientific inquiry is also inherently a form of global, transnational learning that relies on collaborative, communal work. [Outcomes 1, 4-6]
3. Incorporate **social scientific inquiry** more deliberately in the first and second years of study. Inquiry that employs methods of the social sciences should be pursued in some first-year seminars and should be coordinated with other first- or second-year courses in General Education. Courses that develop the habits of mind necessary for critical study of human societies are potentially germane to all of the proposed learning outcomes. [All learning outcomes]

The preceding recommendations do not mean that the General Education Program's present emphasis on humanistic inquiry should be diminished. Rather, these other forms of inquiry should be explored more deliberately in the first and second years of study as complementary with, and in relation to, forms of humanistic inquiry and reflection.

VI.E. Recommendations concerning educational infrastructure

The proposed student learning outcomes also support recommendations concerning the educational infrastructure that makes possible the development and delivery of the common academic program. The following recommendations are fundamentally important for the realization of the educational aims proposed in this report.

1. Expand structures and coordination of opportunities for **learning and living in community**. These should include, but by no means be limited to, learning-living communities for first-year students. Opportunities for multi-year learning communities should also be explored as vehicles through which third- and fourth-year students can exercise academic leadership in the campus community and contribute to younger students' academic development. Values and skills for learning and living in community

should be developed, in part, in the context of engaging the culture and structure of the student neighborhood in both academically guided and religiously grounded ways. This recommendation requires faculty-development support for planning of the curricular elements of learning communities and for expanded collaboration with Student Development and Campus Ministry staff on co-curricular programming. [Learning outcomes 2 and 4]

(NOTE—VI. and VI. F & G to be attached)

Working Group #2

Service Learning, experiential learning and Multidisciplinary/Interdisciplinary Programs

Membership

Andrea Seielstad and Jack O’Gorman, Co-Chairs

P. Aaron

N. Cardilino

M. Doenges

R. Ferguson

V. Forlani

N. Forthofer

K. Hallinan (as needed)

J. Heitmann

A. McGrew

M. Pinnell (as needed)

D. Poe

L. Simmons

APC, Senators, students

Charge

- Determine an efficient structure for conducting the work of the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Develop new model for anchoring service learning in the curriculum.
- Develop principles and template for multidisciplinary minors, self-declared clusters, and problem-based, interdisciplinary courses.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timelines

- An Initial Report is due by **May 15, 2007**. The report should describe how the WG plans to conduct its work (e.g., division into subcommittees, consultation with existing university committees, etc.)

- An Interim Report is due by November 1, 2007. The report should contain preliminary recommendations related to models, principles, and formats for service learning, multidisciplinary minors, self-declared clusters, and problem-based, interdisciplinary courses.
- A Final Report is due February 2008 with any necessary modifications given the Interim reports from other WGs.

Focus

In conducting its work, the WG should consider the following recommendations from the *HIR* report:

VI.C. Recommendations for the second and third years of study

1. Expand curricular and co-curricular offerings in, and support for, **service learning**. In the second year of study, service-learning opportunities should be focused substantially on the City of Dayton and the Greater Miami Valley; in the third year, service learning should be coordinated especially with study abroad or cultural immersion programs. Programmatic structures and pedagogical methods for integrating service experience with academic inquiry, scholarship, and reflection should be promoted. Support for faculty and staff that deliver and coordinate service-learning programs must be increased significantly. The expansion of service-learning programs must proceed with particular attention to respect for the dignity of community partners and the integrity of the University's relationships with them. [Learning outcomes 3-7]
2. Expand and facilitate **multidisciplinary minors and self-declared clusters** as successors to the current thematic cluster requirement. The goals of the thematic clusters are worthy, but their realization could be achieved more meaningfully through either multidisciplinary minors or student designed, self-declared clusters. Such multidisciplinary, integrative structures should focus on addressing real human problems and needs in light of critical evaluation of these times. They should also assist students in their on-going vocational reflections. There may also be a role for occasional course clusters that examine issues of special relevance to our times. Integration could be supported through an expanded student portfolio. Support for development and coordination of multidisciplinary minors would need to be increased significantly. [Learning outcomes 5-7]
3. Create **problem-based, interdisciplinary courses** in General Education designed especially for second- or third-year students. Such courses would aim at developing practical wisdom and critical evaluation of these times. They should develop familiarity with forms of technological and economic analysis, as well as with critical modes of ethical, social, and ecological inquiry, including Catholic Social Teaching. Such courses could belong to multidisciplinary minors or to self-declared or occasional clusters, and should be linked both to the Humanities Base and to majors, where feasible. [Learning outcomes 5-6]

(NOTE—VI. and VI. F & G to be attached)

Working Group #3
Intercultural and Global Learning

Membership

Bob Penno & Mark Brill, Co-Chairs

A. Anderson

R. Brecha

J. Huacuja

P. Marshall, S. M.

M. Niebler

D. Street

F. Penas-Bermejós

APC, Senators, and consultation with Enrollment Management, students

Charge

- Determine an efficient structure for conducting the work of the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Develop new models for curricular revisions to incorporate and expand international and intercultural study.
- Collaborate with WG 1 and 4 regarding objectives for global learning.
- Collaborate with Enrollment Management on identifying the implications of expanding opportunities and expectations for the study of foreign languages.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timeline

- An Initial Report is due from each WG by **May 15, 2007**. The report should describe how the WG plans to conduct its work (e.g., division into subcommittees, consultation with existing university committees, etc.)
- An Interim Report is due by November 1, 2007. The report should contain preliminary recommendations on the models, principles, and formats for expanding international and intercultural study and report on the implications of expanding opportunities and expectations for the study of foreign languages.
- A Final Report for the above, with any necessary modifications given the Interim reports from other WGs, is due February 2008.

Focus

In conducting its work, the WG should consider the following recommendation from the *HIR* report:

4. Expand opportunities for **international and intercultural study**, including curricular revisions to promote **global learning**. Objectives for global learning should be incorporated in all multidisciplinary minors and in many capstone courses, in addition to the Humanities Base. Cultural immersions should incorporate explicit links to the curriculum in order to promote academically-informed reflection and analysis.

Opportunities for and incentives to promote **study of foreign language** should be developed wherever possible for each academic unit. [Learning outcomes 3-4, 6]

(NOTE—VI. and VI. F & G to be attached)

Working Group #4
Student Scholarship and Culminating Experiences

Membership

Rebecca Wells, chair

R. Crum

P. Doepker

T. Ferratt

H. Gauder

D. King

K. Kinnucan-Welch

F. Pestello

E. Wardle

D. Goldman

J. Pierce

APC, Senators, representatives from each school and division, students

Charge

- Determine an efficient structure for conducting the work of the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Develop principles and models for expanding student scholarship throughout the common academic program.
- Develop principles and models for creating capstone experiences in the majors and for general education.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timeline

- An Initial Report is due by **May 15, 2007**. The report should describe how the WG plans to conduct its work (e.g., division into subcommittees, consultation with existing university committees, etc.)
- An Interim Report is due by November 1, 2007. The report should contain preliminary recommendations of principles and models for expanding student scholarship throughout the common academic program and creating capstone experiences in the majors and for general education as a whole.
- A Final Report for the above, with any necessary modifications given the Interim reports from other WGs, is due February 2008.

Focus

In conducting its work, the WG should consider the following recommendation from the *HIR* report:

VI.D. Recommendations for the fourth (or final) year of study

1. Develop a culminating **capstone seminar or project in each major**. Such a seminar or project would aim at promoting scholarship and culminating reflection on vocational discernment and life plans. Such a course or project should also aim to integrate study at various levels in General Education with study in the major. An expanded student portfolio could document such integration and vocational reflection. [Learning outcomes 1 and 7]
2. Create **multidisciplinary capstone course(s) in General Education**. Where feasible within a course of study, such a capstone course could support the previous recommendation, helping to develop and integrate culminating study in General Education in relation to the major. An expanded portfolio system could again be valuable for such a course. The course would also be linked clearly to the Humanities Base and could provide students opportunities to build upon a multidisciplinary minor or self-declared or occasional cluster. The course should emphasize all core learning outcomes. Where feasible, it could be coordinated with capstone seminars in the majors. General Education requirements may need to be modified in order to accommodate such a multidisciplinary capstone in General Education. [All learning outcomes.]
3. Develop and expand structures for requiring, coordinating, funding, and reviewing **student scholarship**. Undergraduate research programs would need to be developed that are appropriate to serve each unit's majors. A portfolio structure could be helpful for coordination and review of student scholarship. [Learning outcome 1]

Recommendations for the common academic program, and especially the third and fourth years of study, should be pursued in ways that support valuable relationships between undergraduate and graduate education, so that undergraduates will be well prepared for graduate work and so that the University's emerging strategies for graduate education are well coordinated with its approach to undergraduate education.

The foregoing recommendations [section VI.A-D] all require substantial investment in faculty development for curricular design and pedagogical innovation, and should inform criteria for faculty hiring.

(NOTE—VI. and VI. F & G to be attached)

Working Group #5
Faculty Development
Communication (W'07)
Pedagogy (F'07)

Membership

ON HOLD PENDING SUBMISSION OF PRELIMINARY REPORTS FROM OTHER WGS.
APC, Senators, Faculty Development Committee, students

Charge

- Review and analyze the current language used to describe UD's programs to any and all audiences. (Recruitment materials, PR, bulletins, web sites, etc., etc.)
- Develop principles and models for aligning academic advising with *HIR*.
- Develop principles and models for creating and funding faculty seminars to enable UD to reach and sustain the revisions/recommendations of all the WGs.
- Develop principles and models for reconfiguring physical spaces to facilitate student learning and sustaining the revisions/recommendations of all the WGs.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Determine an efficient and effective size and structure for the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timelines

- PENDING

Focus

In conducting its work, the WG should consider the following recommendation from the *HIR* report:

VI.E. Recommendations concerning educational infrastructure

The proposed student learning outcomes also support recommendations concerning the educational infrastructure that makes possible the development and delivery of the common academic program. The following recommendations are fundamentally important for the realization of the educational aims proposed in this report.

2. Strengthen structures, support, and faculty preparation for **academic advising**. More effective and better supported academic advising is essential for developmentally sensitive delivery of the common academic program, for meaningful integration of learning across disciplines, for integration of curricular and co-curricular learning, and for sustained reflection on vocation. An expanded portfolio system could facilitate student interaction with advisors. Tools for evaluating academic advising by faculty should be developed and incorporated into reviews for performance, promotion, and tenure. Academic advisors should also work in tandem with the mentoring activities carried out through Student Development and Campus Ministry. [All learning outcomes]
3. Create and fund **faculty seminars** to develop proposals for key elements of a revised curriculum. Possible areas for faculty study might include undergraduate scholarship, the

Catholic and Marianist context for the components of the first-year curriculum, service learning and community-based learning, global learning, or pedagogies for experiential learning in multiple fields. Where possible, faculty seminars should build upon recent faculty development efforts in scholarship, curriculum, and pedagogy. Such seminars would be well suited to the University of Dayton's faculty culture and would be likely to yield thoughtfully developed, innovative pilot programs. [All learning outcomes]

4. Reconfigure **design and assignments of classroom space and course schedules** to facilitate student inquiry, collaboration, and reflection. Successful coordination among courses or between courses and co-curricular experiences also requires creative scheduling and use of space. Protected opportunities for reflection, community building, service activity, or prayer should be created. The busy, distraction-filled environment of the campus otherwise will preclude the deep forms of engagement recommended in this report. The new master plan for the campus should place high priority upon the architectural implications of this report. [All learning outcomes]

Just as the recommendations presented here will require investment in faculty development, they also entail substantially expanded collaboration between faculty and staff, especially in Student Development and Campus Ministry, as well as significantly increased staff support in general.

The Working Group recognizes that the recommendations presented in this section are ambitious and will require thoughtfully prioritized and sensitively planned implementation. Planning for implementation falls outside the scope of the Working Group's charge. However, the ambitious character of the recommendations reflects the high aspirations for the University and its students that were expressed consistently and repeatedly by the many faculty and staff who contributed to this project.

**NOTE—THESE SECTIONS WILL BE ATTACHED TO THE
SPECIFIC CHARGE FOR EACH WG.**

VI. Recommendations for programs, educational infrastructure, and faculty development; implications for faculty work life and university resources

The Working Group offers the following recommendations concerning academic programs, educational infrastructure, and faculty development as preferred ways to advance the educational aims and student learning outcomes proposed for the common academic program. These learning outcomes reflect an educational approach that must attend carefully to undergraduate students' academic and personal development over the course of a four-year degree program.

Recommendations in the first four sub-sections [VI.A-D] are organized in relation to the developmental progression of students' academic experience. The Working Group recognizes that "year of study" does not constitute a discrete developmental stage. Rather, the concept is used to provide a practically manageable way of highlighting certain appropriate points of emphasis along students' four-year educational experience at the university. The final three sub-sections [VI.E-G] identify features of educational infrastructure, faculty work life, and investment of university resources that must be addressed if the recommended programmatic and pedagogical changes are to flourish and the proposed educational aims are to be vital and sustainable.

As well as reflecting the discussions initiated by the Working Group, these recommendations draw upon other work on the curriculum being done by the First Year Team, the Humanities Base Committee, the Cluster Coordinating Committee, the Committee on General Education and Competencies, and faculty involved in various academic excellence initiatives funded by the Provost. These recommendations are also designed to advance the seven strategic goals set out in *A Vision of Excellence*.

VI.F. Implications for faculty work life

Curricular and co-curricular revisions motivated by the educational ideals expressed in this report will require special investments of faculty members' time, talent, and energy. Unless faculty members have the time, funding, and support needed to take meaningful ownership of the programmatic revisions recommended here, the resulting curricular changes will lack academic depth and vitality and will become unsustainable. The following implications for faculty work life are, therefore, particularly important for the flourishing of Catholic, Marianist education at the University of Dayton.

1. Significant contributions to major curricular-revision efforts must be recognized and rewarded appropriately in **annual performance reviews** if faculty commitment to these efforts is to be sustained for the long term. Significant faculty involvement in experiential, inquiry-based learning outside the classroom and the integration of co-curricular activities with the curriculum should also be recognized and rewarded in annual merit reviews.
2. **Reviews for tenure and promotion** likewise must give appropriate recognition to significant faculty contributions to major curricular revisions. This does not mean that standing responsibilities of tenure-line faculty members to be active and productive scholars and contributing members of their departmental, university, and professional communities should diminish. Rather, significant contributions to curriculum revision and co-curricular planning must be supported generously (e.g., through course releases or summer salary) so that faculty working toward tenure or promotion have sufficient time and receive due recognition for such activities.
3. **Faculty workload expectations** may need to be revised in light of the demands imposed by the initiation of major pilot projects in the curriculum and co-curriculum.

VI.G. Implications for resources and coordination

The recommendations presented in this report carry substantial implications for university resources. If these recommendations are to be implemented effectively, the University will need to consider reallocation of current resources and major investment of new resources. The Working Group's study of the history of the current General Education Program revealed that, according to key faculty and administrative advocates for the program, the resources needed for the program to reach and sustain over time its full potential were never realized. Future work on the common academic program should benefit from the lessons of this history.

1. Effective multi- or interdisciplinary curriculum development and teaching, integration of curricular and co-curricular learning, creation of new seminars, and the development of innovative pedagogies suited to these projects will require increased **budgetary support** for new full-time faculty lines and for faculty development, as well as for expanded support staff in such critical areas as service learning, international and intercultural learning, and Residence Education.
 2. **Budget models**, including means of accounting for delivery of student credit hours, will need to be revised in order not merely to permit but also facilitate faculty collaboration across departments, programs, and academic units. Many promising collaborative initiatives in the past have died in their early stages because of the inflexibility of current budget models.
 3. Funding for effective **coordination** of pilot programs and their eventual full-scale implementation will also be required. The work of coordinating programs of the proposed nature and scale will need to be performed collaboratively by faculty members, staff, and administrators alike. Coordination of these programs with other University initiatives will be important and may also require additional resources.
-